UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/084,778	02/27/2002	Melissa W. Dunn	MS# 300222.1 (MSFT 4969.1	1273

			EXAMINER
321 7590 05/02/2005			PATEL, CHIRAG R

SENNIGER POWERS LEAVITT AND ROEDEL
ONE METROPOLITAN SQUARE
16TH FLOOR
ST LOUIS, MO 63102

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2141	

DATE MAILED: 05/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/084,778	DUNN, MELISSA W.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Chirag R. Patel	2141

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>27 February 2002</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-48</u> is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-48</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-12, 18, 20-23, and 25-30 and 32-42 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by O'Flaherty et al. (US 6,253,203).

As per claims 1, 27 and 34, O'Flaherty et al. discloses a method of managing

access by a client to user-specific information maintained in connection with a plurality

of services offered by a web-services provider; A plurality of services is inherent to the

data view suite (Figure 1 items 102, 108) and allows for many services and profiles (Col

7 lines 1-15, Figure 2A) and used by a user of said plurality of services; It is referred to

the owner of the data (Col 4 lines 54-56, Figure 1 item 124) the method comprising:

maintaining a plurality of items user-specific information in more than one of the

plurality of services; (Col 7 lines 1-15)

obtaining a plurality of client access requests directed to accessing the

plurality of items of user-specific information maintained in the more than one of the

plurality of services; System allows for a plurality of requests from a client. (Col 11 lines

28-32, Col 13 lines 50-55, Figure 1 items 110, 112)

said plurality of access requests being translated from a task request that

requires the client to access the plurality of items of user-specific information in order to

complete the task request; (Col 6 line 39-42, Col 11 lines 32-36, Col 13 lines 50-54)

invoking a consent management system if the client lacks consent to

access one of the plurality of items of user-specific information required by the client to

complete the task request; It provides the means to invoke the consent management

system because the user has control to update or change preferences via a client

interface module and allows to monitor the use of personal data and send receive

alerts. (Col 4 lines 34-41, Col 5 lines 45-55, Col 11 lines 36-38, Col 4 lines 54-67, Col 5

lines 1-2, Figure 1 items 102, 114, 116, 122)

said consent management system selectively obtaining consent for the

client to access the one of the plurality of items of user-specific information for which the

client lacked consent to access; and (Col 5 lines 10-21, Col 7 lines 28-35)

filling the plurality of client access requests if the client has permission to

access each of the plurality of items of user-specific information in the more than one of

the plurality of services (Col 4 lines 30-34, Col 11 lines 32-36, Col 11 lines 51-59,

Figure 1 item 108)

As per claim 2, O'Flaherty et al. discloses the method of claim 1 further comprising:

initiating the task request requiring the client to access the plurality of items of user-specific information in order to complete the task request; (Col 11 lines 28-32) and translating the task request into the plurality of client access requests to complete the task request. (Col 6 line 39-42, Col 11 lines 32-36, Col 13 lines 50-54)

As per claim 3, O'Flaherty et al. discloses the method of claim 2 wherein selectively obtaining consent for the client to access the one of the plurality of items of user-specific information comprises:

identifying the task request, (Col 10 lines 57-63, Col 11 lines 29-32)

placing the identified task request in a task queue; (Col 11 lines 38-43, Figure 4 item 402)

identifying a party with authority to grant consent to the client to access the one of the plurality of items of user-specific information for which the client lacked consent to access; (Col 5 lines 26-30) and

displaying a consent menu to the identified party with authority, said consent menu prompting the identified party to grant or deny consent for the client to access the one of the plurality of items of user-specific information for which the client lacked consent to access. (Col 5 lines 10-21, Col 7 lines 28-35, Col 11 lines 36-37, Figure 1 item 122)

As per claims 4 and 28, O'Flaherty et al. discloses the method of 3 wherein the identified party with authority to grant consent is the user of the plurality of services offered by the web-services provider and wherein displaying the consent menu to the identified party comprises displaying the consent menu to the user. (Col 4 lines 54-56, Col 5 lines 10-21, Figure 1 item 124)

As per claims 5 and 29, O'Flaherty et al. discloses the method of claim 3 wherein the identified party with authority to grant consent is an owner of the one of the plurality of items of user-specific information for which the client lacked consent to access and wherein displaying the consent menu to the identified party comprises displaying the consent menu to the owner; The client is an owner of the information. (Col 4 lines 54-56, Col 5 lines 10-21, Col 11 lines 36-37, Figure 1 item 124)

As per claim 6, O'Flaherty et al. discloses the method of claim 5 wherein the owner is the user of the plurality of services and wherein displaying the consent menu to the identified party comprises displaying the consent menu to the user; The consumer is the owner of the personal data. (Col 4 lines 54-56, Figure 1 item 124)

As per claims 7 and 30, O'Flaherty et al. discloses the method of claim 3 wherein the user of the plurality of services is a managed user and the identified party with authority to grant consent is a manager of the managed user and wherein displaying the

consent menu to the identified party comprises displaying the consent menu to the

manager of the managed user. (Col 11 lines 60-63)

As per claim 8, O'Flaherty et al. discloses the method of claim 3 wherein

displaying the consent menu to the identified party comprises:

displaying an indication of the one of the plurality of items of user-specific information

for which the client lacked consent to access; (Col 5 lines 49-52)

As per claim 9, O'Flaherty et al. discloses the method of claim 8 wherein

displaying a consent menu to the identified party further comprises displaying a method

of access requested by the client to complete the initiated task request; The method of

access in this case is a read/write. (Col 5 lines 49-54)

As per claim 10, O'Flaherty et al. discloses the method of claim 8 wherein

displaying a consent menu to the identified party further comprises displaying an

indication of a status of each of the plurality of client access requests translated from

the task request. (Col 11 lines 32-34, Figure 1 item 108)

As per claim 11, O'Flaherty et al. discloses the method of claim 10 wherein

displaying an indication of the status of each of the plurality of client access requests

comprises displaying an indication of whether the client has consent from the identified

party to access the plurality of items of user-specific information in the more than one of

the plurality of services. (Col 11 lines 65-67, Col 12 lines 10-14, Figure 1 item 114)

As per claim 12, O'Flaherty et al. discloses the method of claim 3 wherein

identifying the task request comprises:

transmitting a task identifier to the consent management system, said task

identifier identifying the plurality of client access requests to complete the task request,

and identifying the one of the plurality of items of user-specific information for which

the client lacked consent to access. (Col 11 lines 36-43, Col 13 lines 49-54)

As per claims 18 and 32, O'Flaherty et al. discloses the method of claim 3

wherein selectively obtaining consent for the client to access the one of the plurality of

items of user-specific information farther comprises sending an alert message to the

party with authority to grant consent, said alert message alerting the party with authority

to grant consent that the client seeks access to the one of the plurality of items of user-

specific information for which the client lacked consent. (Col 4 lines 34-41, Col 5 lines

45-55, Col 11 lines 36-38, Col 4 lines 54-67, Col 5 lines 1-2, Figure 1 items 102, 114,

116, 122)

As per claims 21 and 39-40, O'Flaherty et al. discloses a task-based method of

managing consent transactions in a network computing environment, said network

computing environment including a web-services provider providing a first service and a

second service; The second service is inherent to the data view suite (Figure 1 items

102, 108) and allows for many services and profiles (Col 7 lines 1-15, Figure 2A) a user

of the first service and the second service; It is referred to the owner of the data (Col 4

lines 54-56, Figure 1 item 124) and a client of the web-services provider, one who

attempts to access the data (Figure 1 items 110, 112) the method comprising:

maintaining a first data store of user-specific information in connection with the

first service; (Col 14 lines 27-30, Col 3 lines 65-67)

maintaining a second data store of user-specific information in connection with

the second service; (Col 14 lines 30-32, Col 3 lines 65-67)

obtaining a first access request from the client and directed to the first service,

said first access request indicating a first item of user-specific information maintained in

the first data store to which the client seeks access in order to complete a task request;

(Col 11 lines 28-32, Col 7 lines 1-15, Figure 2A)

obtaining a second access request from the client and directed to the second

service, said second access request indicating a second item of user-specific

information maintained in the second data store to which the client seeks access in

order to complete the task request; A second request is inherent because it allows for a

plurality of requests from a client. (Col 11 lines 28-32, Col 13 lines 50-55, Figure 1

items 110, 112)

determining if the client has consent to access the first item of user-specific

information and the second item of user-specific information; (Col 4 lines 30-34, Col 11

lines 51-59, Figure 1 item 108)

. invoking a consent management system if it is determined that consent does not

currently exist to allow the client to access the first item of user-specific information;

It provides the means to invoke the consent management system because the user has

control to update or change preferences via a client interface module and allows to to

monitor the use of personal data and receive alerts. (Col 4 lines 34-41, Col 5 lines 45-

55, Col 11 lines 36-38, Col 4 lines 54-67, Col 5 lines 1-2, Figure 1 items 102, 114, 116,

122) said consent management system conducting a consent management transaction

comprising:

identifying a party with authority to grant consent to the client to access

the first item of user-specific information; and (Col 5 lines 26-30)

displaying a consent menu to the identified party with authority, said consent

menu prompting the identified party to grant or deny consent to the client to access the

first item of user-specific information. (Col 5 lines 10-21, Col 7 lines 28-35, Figure 1

. item 122)

As per claim 22, O'Flaherty et al. discloses the method of claim 21 further

comprising:

initiating a task request from the user that requires the client to access the first

item of user-specific information and the second item of user-specific information; (Col

11 lines 28-32) and translating the task request into the first access request and the

second access request. (Col 6 line 39-42, Col 11 lines 32-36, Col 13 lines 50-54)

As per claim 23, O'Flaherty et al. discloses the method of claim 21 wherein invoking the consent management system further comprises identifying the task request and wherein conducting a consent management transaction further comprises: retrieving a task manifest corresponding to the task request, said task manifest identifying the first and second items of user-specific information; and preparing an entry for display on the consent menu based on the task manifest. (Col 7 lines 65-67, Col 8 lines 1-4, Col 10 lines 57-63, Col 11 lines 29-32, Figure 1 item 108)

As per claims 20, 25 and 33, O'Flaherty et al. discloses one or more computer-readable media having computer-executable instructions for performing the method recited in claim 21. (Col 6 lines 57-60)

As per claim 26, please see the discussion under claims 1 and 3 as they relate to the same subject matter.

As per claim 35, please see the discussion under claims 3 and 13 under O'Flaherty et al. as they relate to the same subject matter.

As per claim 36, please see the discussion under claims 4 and 13 under O'Flaherty et al. as they relate to the same subject matter.

As per claims 37 and 41, O'Flaherty et al. discloses the system of claim 35

wherein the consent menu; accessible through an interface (Figure 1 item 122) in which

a user of data can specify the preferences as listed below; identifies a plurality of menu

entries comprising:

an identity of the client; allows override of customer's (Figure 1 item 110,112)

preferences (Col 4 lines 34-41)

a method by which the client seeks to access the item of user-specific

information; read and write are the methods of access to the data (Col 5 lines 49-54)

a purpose for which the client seeks to access the item of user-specific

information. (Col 5 lines 15-17)

As per claims 38 and 42, O'Flaherty et al. discloses the system of claim 37

wherein the plurality of menu entries further comprises a value proposition associated

with the purpose for which the client desires to access the first item of user-specific

information. (Col 5 lines 18-21)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 13-15, 19 and 43-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over O'Flaherty et al. (US 6,253,203) in view of Wong et al. (US

2001/0042126).

As per claims 13, O'Flaherty et al. discloses the method of claim 3 further

comprising: updating an access control list associated with the one of the plurality of

items of user-specific information for which the client lacked consent if the consent

acceptance message indicates that the identified party granted consent, whereby upon

updating said access control list, the client has consent to access the one of the plurality

of items of user-specific information; The privacy rules database and security serve the

same functions as the access control list, and the user can update the permissions.

(Col 9 lines 66-67, Col 10 lines 1-6, Figure 1 items 152,154)

O'Flaherty et al. does not disclose providing a consent acceptance message to

the client. Wong et al. discloses providing a consent acceptance message being

indicative of whether the identified party granted consent for the client to access the one

of the plurality of items of user-specific information for which the client lacked consent;

([0011], [0050], Figure 5 items 510, 220c, Figure 6 items 614, 616) It would have been

obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to include an

consent acceptance message in the disclosure of O'Flaherty et al. because it allows to

organize who is granted or denied what kind of access to the presence information.

[0046]

As per claim 14, O'Flaherty et al. / Wong et al. discloses the method of claim 13

and O'Flaherty et al. discloses further comprising removing the identified task from the

task queue if the consent acceptance message indicates that the identified party

granted consent. (Col 9 lines 16-20,Col 11 lines 38-43, Figure 4 item 402)

As per claims 15 and 19, O'Flaherty et al./ Wong et al. discloses the method of

claim 13 further comprising transmitting a consent success message to the client.

O'Flaherty et al. fails to discloses said consent success message being indicative of

whether the

identified party granted consent for the client to access the one of the plurality of

items of user-specific information for which the client lacked consent. Wong et al.

discloses said consent success message being indicative of whether the

identified party granted consent for the client to access the one of the plurality of

items of user-specific information for which the client lacked consent. ([0011], [0050],

Figure 5 items 510, 220c, Figure 6 item 214) It would have been obvious to a person of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to include an consent acceptance

message of whether the identified party granted consent in the disclosure of O'Flaherty

fbecause it allows to organize who is granted or denied what kind of access to the

presence information. [0046]

As per claim 43, O'Flaherty et al. discloses a method of controlling access to

user-specific information for use in connection with a network computing environment

including a web-services provider; A plurality of services is inherent to the data view

suite (Figure 1 items 102, 108) and allows for many services and profiles (Col 7 lines 1-

15, Figure 2A) a user of a service provided by the web-services provider, and a client of

the web-services provider, It is referred to the owner of the data (Col 4 lines 54-56,

Figure 1 item 124) said web-services provider maintaining a data store of user-specific

information associated with the user in connection with the service, (Col 3 lines 65-67,

Figure 1 item 106) and said client seeking access to an item of user-specific information

in the data store and transmitting an access request message directed to the service

and indicating the item of user-specific information in the data store to which the client

seeks access, (Col 11 lines 28-32) the method comprising:

comparing the access request message to an access control list associated with the

service, said access control list identifying whether the client has permission to access

the item of user-specific information; (Col 4 lines 30-34, Col 11 lines 32-36, Col 11 lines

51-59, Figure 1 item 108) The privacy rules database and security serve the same

functions as the access control list (Figure 1 items 152,154)

placing the access request in a pending request queue; (Col 11 lines 38-43,

Figure 4 item 402)

invoking a consent management system if the service response message

received by the client indicates a fault; and ; It provides the means to invoke the consent

management system because the user has control to update or change preferences via

a client interface module and allows to monitor the use of personal data and send

receive alerts. (Col 4 lines 34-41, Col 5 lines 45-55, Col 11 lines 36-38, Col 4 lines 54-67, Col 5 lines 1-2, Figure 1 items 102, 114, 116, 122)

filling the access request if the access control list authorizes the client to access the item of user-specific information in the data store and removing the access request from the pending request queue. (Col 9 lines 16-20,Col 11 lines 38-43, Figure 1 items 152,154, Figure 4 item 402)

O'Flaherty et al. fails to discloses transmitting a service response message to the client indicating a fault or a success message. Wong et al. discloses transmitting a service response message to the client, said service response message indicating a fault if the access control list identifies that the client does not have permission to access the item of user-specific information and said service response message indicating a success if the access control list identifies that the client has permission to access the item of user-specific information; ([0011], [0050], Figure 5 items 510, 220c, Figure 6 items 614, 616) It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to transmit a service response message to a client in the disclosure of O'Flaherty et al. because it allows to organize who is granted or denied what kind of access to the presence information. [0046]

As per claim 44, please see the discussion under claim 3 as it relates to the same subject matter.

As per claim 45, please see the discussion under claim 4 as it relates to the same subject matter.

As per claim 46, please see the discussion under claim 5 as it relates to the same subject matter.

As per claim 47, please see the discussion under claim 7 as it relates to the same subject matter.

As per claim 48, please see the discussion under claim 20 as it relates to the same subject matter.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Flaherty et al. (US 6,253,203)/Wong et al. (US 2001/0042126) further in view of Numao et al. (US2001/0023421).

As per claim 16, O'Flaherty et al. / Wong et al. discloses the method of claim 13. O'Flaherty et al./ Wong et al. fails to discloses a time limit in which the client has consent to access the one of the plurality of items of user-specific information. Numao et al. discloses wherein updating the access control list further comprises setting a time limit in which the client has consent to access the one of the plurality of items of user-specific information. ([0125]). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill

in the art at the time the invention to include a time limit for accessing user-specific

information in the disclosure of O'Flaherty et al. because it allows for the information to

be strictly controlled. ([0125])

Claims 17 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over O'Flaherty et al. (US 6,253,203) in view of Hillis et al. (2003/0196094)

As per claims 17 and 31, O'Flaherty et al. discloses the method of claim 3

wherein displaying the consent menu to the identified party (Figure 1 item 122)

however, fails to discloses displaying an invitation to allow the client enjoy a one-time

only access to the one of the plurality of items of user-specific information. It would

have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to

allow the client to enjoy a one-time only access to information in the disclosure of

O'Flaherty et al. because it allows to determine the users levels of authorization with

regard to the information desired. ([0364]).

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

O'Flaherty et al. (US 6,253,203) in view of Numao et al. (US2001/0023421).

As per claim 24, O'Flaherty discloses the method of claim 21 and both the first

item of user-specific information and the second item of user-specific information; The

second service is inherent to the data view suite (Figure 1 items 102, 108) and allows

for many services and profiles (Col 7 lines 1-15, Figure 2A) O'Flaherty fails to disclose

filling the second access request only if the client has consent to access both the first

item of user-specific information and the second item of user-specific information.

Numao et al. discloses further comprising filling the second access request only if the

client has consent to access both the first item of user-specific information and the

second item of user-specific information. ([0075]) It would have been obvious to a

person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to fill the second access

request in the disclosure of O'Flaherty because it allows for the right to access

information in a specific condition ([0066], Figure 6 item) and allows for the information

to be strictly controlled. ([0125])

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure. O'Flaherty et al. (US 6,275,824) discloses a database

management system, for storing and retrieving data from a plurality of database tables

wherein the data in the database tables is controllably accessible according to privacy

parameters stored in the database table. O'Flaherty et al. (US 6,631,361) discloses a

method and apparatus for providing explanations of automated decisions applied to

user data.   Veldhuisen (US 6,480,850) discloses a method and apparatus for managing

consumer notification and access and a means of correction and change of preferences

for privacy or data protection in a data warehousing system including a physically

separate but dependently connected data mart. Itabashi et al. (US 6,482,752) discloses

allowing a user to receive the provision of information in a simple and low-cost manner from any location in the communication environment. Bleizeffer (US 2002/0188572) discloses an interface for creating privacy policies for the P3P specification. Juels (US 2002/0026345) discloses a targeted delivery of informational content with privacy protection. Blasko (US 2001/0049620) discloses a privacy protected targeted system. Morti (US2002/0019828) discloses a computer-implemented method and apparatus for obtaining permission based data.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chirag R. Patel whose telephone number is (571)272-7966. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 7:30AM to 4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia, can be reached on (571) 272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER